

Forecast of Congress.

Probable Program of the Week's Proceedings.

THE CHICAGO WORLD'S FAIR BILL.

It will be passed early in the week, and then several other important measures will be brought up and considered—Other Washington Dispatches.

WASHINGTON, March 24.—The proceedings of the house during the coming week will be enlivened by the discussion on the Chicago world's fair bill on Tuesday. There will be some opposition to the measure, but the impression among members is that the bill will be passed without substantial change. Measures concerning the District of Columbia will occupy the house on Monday. Among the bills that will come up for passage will be one to establish a Columbus memorial park on Rock creek, near this city. The bill to admit Wyoming to statehood will be discussed, but probably not passed to a vote. Other measures of lesser interest will occupy the house during the rest of the week. The senate will dispose of the Sherman anti-trust measure some time during the week, but the measure will be debated until quite a late day. When it is out of the way the undershafting bill will be taken up. There was no opposition to the bill from the Democrats on the finance committee, and the bill will be reported. There may be some debate over the amendments offered by the senate committee, but this will not consume much time.

Today the motion of Mr. Ingalls to refer the measure to the committee on the river and harbor bill will be taken up. The measure will be passed by the house, and it will likely be agreed to. In anticipation of this action Mr. Blair has introduced a bill in a new form, and very likely he will report it to the senate favorably before the end of the week. The bill will be taken up by the senate on the calendar, though, and the probability is that it is dead for this season at least.

The Delph committee, investigating the secret session leakage, is about ready to present a supplementary report. What action will be taken upon it is problematical. The senate may take up this matter in the recess session for either the Florida nomination or it may take up the Montana contest. It is ready and will be presented to the senate Monday, and the measure will be called up for argument and action early in the following week.

Saturday's Congress. WASHINGTON, March 24.—On the bill to appropriate \$300,000 for a public building at San Diego cannot be considered. Mr. Blair introduced another educational bill. Fifty bills were passed, and a great many more were introduced. At 4:30 p. m. the senate adjourned.

In the house, after the unimportant legislation, including the passage of two public building bills, adjourned was delivered on the late K. J. Gay, of Louisiana.

Colonel Warren's Col. W. W. WASHINGTON, March 22.—Col. W. W. Warren is still in an entirely helpless state and very weak. After a week at Providence hospital, under good medical treatment and kind ministrations, he came up today. The condition of the patient is such that the prospects of his ultimate recovery of health and strength are very slight.

INTERNATIONAL SUBSIDY Proposed to Run a Steamship Line Between San Francisco and Valparaiso. WASHINGTON, March 24.—The International American conference Friday received the report of the committee on communication on the Pacific ocean. The committee recommended that the nations along the coast of the Pacific ocean, the American continent, and represented in this conference, agree to subsidize or more nearly subsidize the line which shall make regular voyage between the port of San Francisco and Valparaiso, Chile, and the intermediate ports, such vessels to make bi-monthly round trips, paying each port a subsidy of \$100,000 every year, and of not less than 4,000 tons capacity.

Passengers are prohibited from entering into any arrangement or combination to increase passenger or freight rates, but a compensation for this service a subsidy is provided for to be paid annually by the subscribing nations in proportion to their respective tonnage. The amount, however, is not to exceed thirty cents per gross registered ton for each 1,000 miles sailed.

The conference Friday adopted the report of the committee on communication on the Pacific ocean, and the Caribbean sea, already published.

Blindling Train. MINNEAPOLIS, Minn., March 24.—It was out for the night on the Chicago and North Western, and it was seriously wounded yesterday afternoon, near Jay, Minn. A train of five cars, carrying a large number of passengers, was derailed by a landslide. The train was derailed by a landslide, and the passengers were seriously injured. The train was derailed by a landslide, and the passengers were seriously injured.

A Conductor's Fatal Quarrel. MOBILE, Ala., March 21.—E. B. McCurdy, conductor of a Louisville and Nashville railway train, was shot and seriously wounded yesterday afternoon, near Jay, Minn. A train of five cars, carrying a large number of passengers, was derailed by a landslide. The train was derailed by a landslide, and the passengers were seriously injured.

A Father's Innocence Established. CHARLOTTE, N. C., March 24.—The jury in the case of the state vs. Andrew Edger returned a verdict of not guilty Friday. Edger, who is about 55 years of age, has been confined in jail for some time, and was recently indicted by the grand jury on charges of rape and murder. The jury found him innocent.

Died for Love and Jealousy. WOODMAN, O., March 24.—Robert Caskey, of Orrville, the man who shot himself in the head Tuesday because he was jealous of the attention given to his wife's sweetheart, died Friday morning.

Slain His Playmate. JOLIET, Ill., March 24.—Tommy Wineham, 13 years old, shot and killed Bertie Polhamus, 11 years old, yesterday. The boys were playing marbles, and a disagreement in the game caused the Wineham boy to draw a pistol and shoot his little playmate in the stomach. There are no facilities for fighting the fire.

Heaven Crowded With Angels. ROCKFORD, Ill., March 21.—The Schweinfurthians will hold their first meeting at "Heaven." There are one hundred persons present, and all sleep under the same roof. Inasmuch as there are sleeping accommodations for only about thirty, the "angels" are rather crowded, but Schweinfurth said yesterday that all were pure-minded and free from any worldly passion, and they could therefore all be accommodated very well.

AN IMPORTANT DECISION.

The Inhabitants of Taxation in Certain Cases Settled.

CINCINNATI, March 24.—Judge Norris Saturday announced his decision in the matter of liability for taxation of stock which had not been listed because of opinions of the proper officers that the same was not liable.

The action was brought by Morgan, the tax collector, and included the years 1881-82 inclusive. The proceedings were based on Section 2781, as amended in 1888, which provides a penalty for "false returns."

The court found that the conveyed knowledge of the stock and county and to the holder of the stock, and that the stock was not liable for taxation.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Then the holder was admonished of the intention to tax the stock, so the defendant cannot claim promissory estoppel under former rulings and practices. Judgment was given for the plaintiff, and the case is closed.

Blair Defeated.

The Senate Votes on the Much Discussed Question.

THIRTY-ONE TO THIRTY-SEVEN.

Mr. Blair Changes His Vote and Moves a Recessionist—Mud Was Declared Elected and Seated in the House—Other Washington Dispatches.

WASHINGTON, March 21.—In the senate yesterday, after Mr. Cockrell presented the protest of the Port Packing association, of St. Louis, against the bill for the inspection of meats, which was referred, the educational bill was taken up. After brief remarks by Mr. Blair, Mr. Blair rose to close the debate. He said he looked upon the education of the colored people as the solution of the race question. But the white people constituted the great mass of the nation, and on their condition depended the future of the United States and the future of the world.

The senate then proceeded to vote on the bill and amendments. The first vote was on three amendments offered by Mr. Moody, of South Dakota, to the effect that the illiterates among the Indians shall be included in the calculation. Mr. Blair said there was no objection to the amendments.

Mr. Edmunds took the opportunity of speaking to the amendments, in order to defend the constitutionality of the bill. He asserted that there was no moral or legal objection to the constitutionality of the bill. He favored the bill for the effect it would have upon the new states, and also upon the existing states.

In the latter part of the day, the senate proceeded to vote on the bill. The first vote was on three amendments offered by Mr. Moody, of South Dakota, to the effect that the illiterates among the Indians shall be included in the calculation. Mr. Blair said there was no objection to the amendments.

Mr. Edmunds took the opportunity of speaking to the amendments, in order to defend the constitutionality of the bill. He asserted that there was no moral or legal objection to the constitutionality of the bill. He favored the bill for the effect it would have upon the new states, and also upon the existing states.

In the latter part of the day, the senate proceeded to vote on the bill. The first vote was on three amendments offered by Mr. Moody, of South Dakota, to the effect that the illiterates among the Indians shall be included in the calculation. Mr. Blair said there was no objection to the amendments.

Mr. Edmunds took the opportunity of speaking to the amendments, in order to defend the constitutionality of the bill. He asserted that there was no moral or legal objection to the constitutionality of the bill. He favored the bill for the effect it would have upon the new states, and also upon the existing states.

In the latter part of the day, the senate proceeded to vote on the bill. The first vote was on three amendments offered by Mr. Moody, of South Dakota, to the effect that the illiterates among the Indians shall be included in the calculation. Mr. Blair said there was no objection to the amendments.

Mr. Edmunds took the opportunity of speaking to the amendments, in order to defend the constitutionality of the bill. He asserted that there was no moral or legal objection to the constitutionality of the bill. He favored the bill for the effect it would have upon the new states, and also upon the existing states.

In the latter part of the day, the senate proceeded to vote on the bill. The first vote was on three amendments offered by Mr. Moody, of South Dakota, to the effect that the illiterates among the Indians shall be included in the calculation. Mr. Blair said there was no objection to the amendments.

Mr. Edmunds took the opportunity of speaking to the amendments, in order to defend the constitutionality of the bill. He asserted that there was no moral or legal objection to the constitutionality of the bill. He favored the bill for the effect it would have upon the new states, and also upon the existing states.

In the latter part of the day, the senate proceeded to vote on the bill. The first vote was on three amendments offered by Mr. Moody, of South Dakota, to the effect that the illiterates among the Indians shall be included in the calculation. Mr. Blair said there was no objection to the amendments.

Mr. Edmunds took the opportunity of speaking to the amendments, in order to defend the constitutionality of the bill. He asserted that there was no moral or legal objection to the constitutionality of the bill. He favored the bill for the effect it would have upon the new states, and also upon the existing states.

In the latter part of the day, the senate proceeded to vote on the bill. The first vote was on three amendments offered by Mr. Moody, of South Dakota, to the effect that the illiterates among the Indians shall be included in the calculation. Mr. Blair said there was no objection to the amendments.

Mr. Edmunds took the opportunity of speaking to the amendments, in order to defend the constitutionality of the bill. He asserted that there was no moral or legal objection to the constitutionality of the bill. He favored the bill for the effect it would have upon the new states, and also upon the existing states.

In the latter part of the day, the senate proceeded to vote on the bill. The first vote was on three amendments offered by Mr. Moody, of South Dakota, to the effect that the illiterates among the Indians shall be included in the calculation. Mr. Blair said there was no objection to the amendments.

Mr. Edmunds took the opportunity of speaking to the amendments, in order to defend the constitutionality of the bill. He asserted that there was no moral or legal objection to the constitutionality of the bill. He favored the bill for the effect it would have upon the new states, and also upon the existing states.

In the latter part of the day, the senate proceeded to vote on the bill. The first vote was on three amendments offered by Mr. Moody, of South Dakota, to the effect that the illiterates among the Indians shall be included in the calculation. Mr. Blair said there was no objection to the amendments.

Mr. Edmunds took the opportunity of speaking to the amendments, in order to defend the constitutionality of the bill. He asserted that there was no moral or legal objection to the constitutionality of the bill. He favored the bill for the effect it would have upon the new states, and also upon the existing states.

In the latter part of the day, the senate proceeded to vote on the bill. The first vote was on three amendments offered by Mr. Moody, of South Dakota, to the effect that the illiterates among the Indians shall be included in the calculation. Mr. Blair said there was no objection to the amendments.

Mr. Edmunds took the opportunity of speaking to the amendments, in order to defend the constitutionality of the bill. He asserted that there was no moral or legal objection to the constitutionality of the bill. He favored the bill for the effect it would have upon the new states, and also upon the existing states.

In the latter part of the day, the senate proceeded to vote on the bill. The first vote was on three amendments offered by Mr. Moody, of South Dakota, to the effect that the illiterates among the Indians shall be included in the calculation. Mr. Blair said there was no objection to the amendments.

Mr. Edmunds took the opportunity of speaking to the amendments, in order to defend the constitutionality of the bill. He asserted that there was no moral or legal objection to the constitutionality of the bill. He favored the bill for the effect it would have upon the new states, and also upon the existing states.

In the latter part of the day, the senate proceeded to vote on the bill. The first vote was on three amendments offered by Mr. Moody, of South Dakota, to the effect that the illiterates among the Indians shall be included in the calculation. Mr. Blair said there was no objection to the amendments.

Mr. Edmunds took the opportunity of speaking to the amendments, in order to defend the constitutionality of the bill. He asserted that there was no moral or legal objection to the constitutionality of the bill. He favored the bill for the effect it would have upon the new states, and also upon the existing states.

In the latter part of the day, the senate proceeded to vote on the bill. The first vote was on three amendments offered by Mr. Moody, of South Dakota, to the effect that the illiterates among the Indians shall be included in the calculation. Mr. Blair said there was no objection to the amendments.

Mr. Edmunds took the opportunity of speaking to the amendments, in order to defend the constitutionality of the bill. He asserted that there was no moral or legal objection to the constitutionality of the bill. He favored the bill for the effect it would have upon the new states, and also upon the existing states.

In the latter part of the day, the senate proceeded to vote on the bill. The first vote was on three amendments offered by Mr. Moody, of South Dakota, to the effect that the illiterates among the Indians shall be included in the calculation. Mr. Blair said there was no objection to the amendments.

Mr. Edmunds took the opportunity of speaking to the amendments, in order to defend the constitutionality of the bill. He asserted that there was no moral or legal objection to the constitutionality of the bill. He favored the bill for the effect it would have upon the new states, and also upon the existing states.

In the latter part of the day, the senate proceeded to vote on the bill. The first vote was on three amendments offered by Mr. Moody, of South Dakota, to the effect that the illiterates among the Indians shall be included in the calculation. Mr. Blair said there was no objection to the amendments.

Mr. Edmunds took the opportunity of speaking to the amendments, in order to defend the constitutionality of the bill. He asserted that there was no moral or legal objection to the constitutionality of the bill. He favored the bill for the effect it would have upon the new states, and also upon the existing states.

In the latter part of the day, the senate proceeded to vote on the bill. The first vote was on three amendments offered by Mr. Moody, of South Dakota, to the effect that the illiterates among the Indians shall be included in the calculation. Mr. Blair said there was no objection to the amendments.

Mr. Edmunds took the opportunity of speaking to the amendments, in order to defend the constitutionality of the bill. He asserted that there was no moral or legal objection to the constitutionality of the bill. He favored the bill for the effect it would have upon the new states, and also upon the existing states.

In the latter part of the day, the senate proceeded to vote on the bill. The first vote was on three amendments offered by Mr. Moody, of South Dakota, to the effect that the illiterates among the Indians shall be included in the calculation. Mr. Blair said there was no objection to the amendments.

Mr. Edmunds took the opportunity of speaking to the amendments, in order to defend the constitutionality of the bill. He asserted that there was no moral or legal objection to the constitutionality of the bill. He favored the bill for the effect it would have upon the new states, and also upon the existing states.

In the latter part of the day, the senate proceeded to vote on the bill. The first vote was on three amendments offered by Mr. Moody, of South Dakota, to the effect that the illiterates among the Indians shall be included in the calculation. Mr. Blair said there was no objection to the amendments.

Mr. Edmunds took the opportunity of speaking to the amendments, in order to defend the constitutionality of the bill. He asserted that there was no moral or legal objection to the constitutionality of the bill. He favored the bill for the effect it would have upon the new states, and also upon the existing states.

In the latter part of the day, the senate proceeded to vote on the bill. The first vote was on three amendments offered by Mr. Moody, of South Dakota, to the effect that the illiterates among the Indians shall be included in the calculation. Mr. Blair said there was no objection to the amendments.

Mr. Edmunds took the opportunity of speaking to the amendments, in order to defend the constitutionality of the bill. He asserted that there was no moral or legal objection to the constitutionality of the bill. He favored the bill for the effect it would have upon the new states, and also upon the existing states.

AFTER FIVE DAYS' ILLNESS.

Death of Gen. Robert C. Schenck at His Washington Home.

WASHINGTON, March 24.—Gen. Robert C. Schenck died at his home at 5:45 p. m. yesterday of pneumonia, after an illness of but five days.

Gen. Schenck was in the sixty-first year of his age, and his career as a soldier, congressman and diplomat was a remarkably busy one. He was born in Franklin, O., on Oct. 4, 1829.

He was first elected to congress in 1850 and served four terms, and until 1851 when he was sent by President Fillmore as minister to Brazil.

When the civil war broke out he promptly offered his services, and was appointed by President Lincoln, his commission bearing the date of May 17, 1861.

Gen. Schenck was a member of the division of the army of the Potomac, and in December, 1870, he was appointed minister to England by President Grant. Resigning his post as minister, in 1870, Gen. Schenck returned to Washington, where he has since resided.

He was a member of the House of Representatives, and served four terms, and until 1851 when he was sent by President Fillmore as minister to Brazil.

When the civil war broke out he promptly offered his services, and was appointed by President Lincoln, his commission bearing the date of May 17, 1861.

Gen. Schenck was a member of the division of the army of the Potomac, and in December, 1870, he was appointed minister to England by President Grant. Resigning his post as minister, in 1870, Gen. Schenck returned to Washington, where he has since resided.

He was a member of the House of Representatives, and served four terms, and until 1851 when he was sent by President Fillmore as minister to Brazil.

When the civil war broke out he promptly offered his services, and was appointed by President Lincoln, his commission bearing the date of May 17, 1861.

Gen. Schenck was a member of the division of the army of the Potomac, and in December, 1870, he was appointed minister to England by President Grant. Resigning his post as minister, in 1870, Gen. Schenck returned to Washington, where he has since resided.

He was a member of the House of Representatives, and served four terms, and until 1851 when he was sent by President Fillmore as minister to Brazil.

When the civil war broke out he promptly offered his services, and was appointed by President Lincoln, his commission bearing the date of May 17, 1861.

Gen. Schenck was a member of the division of the army of the Potomac, and in December, 1870, he was appointed minister to England by President Grant. Resigning his post as minister, in 1870, Gen. Schenck returned to Washington, where he has since resided.

He was a member of the House of Representatives, and served four terms, and until 1851 when he was sent by President Fillmore as minister to Brazil.

When the civil war broke out he promptly offered his services, and was appointed by President Lincoln, his commission bearing the date of May 17, 1861.

Gen. Schenck was a member of the division of the army of the Potomac, and in December, 1870, he was appointed minister to England by President Grant. Resigning his post as minister, in 1870, Gen. Schenck returned to Washington, where he has since resided.

He was a member of the House of Representatives, and served four terms, and until 1851 when he was sent by President Fillmore as minister to Brazil.

When the civil war broke out he promptly offered his services, and was appointed by President Lincoln, his commission bearing the date of May 17, 1861.

Gen. Schenck was a member of the division of the army of the Potomac, and in December, 1870, he was appointed minister to England by President Grant. Resigning his post as minister, in 1870, Gen. Schenck returned to Washington, where he has since resided.

He was a member of the House of Representatives, and served four terms, and until 1851 when he was sent by President Fillmore as minister to Brazil.

When the civil war broke out he promptly offered his services, and was appointed by President Lincoln, his commission bearing the date of May 17, 1861.

Gen. Schenck was a member of the division of the army of the Potomac, and in December, 1870, he was appointed minister to England by President Grant. Resigning his post as minister, in 1870, Gen. Schenck returned to Washington, where he has since resided.

He was a member of the House of Representatives, and served four terms, and until 1851 when he was sent by President Fillmore as minister to Brazil.

When the civil war broke out he promptly offered his services, and was appointed by President Lincoln, his commission bearing the date of May 17, 1861.

Gen. Schenck was a member of the division of the army of the Potomac, and in December, 1870, he was appointed minister to England by President Grant. Resigning his post as minister, in 1870, Gen. Schenck returned to Washington, where he has since resided.

He was a member of the House of Representatives, and served four terms, and until 1851 when he was sent by President Fillmore as minister to Brazil.

When the civil war broke out he promptly offered his services, and was appointed by President Lincoln, his commission bearing the date of May 17, 1861.

Gen. Schenck was a member of the division of the army of the Potomac, and in December, 1870, he was appointed minister to England by President Grant. Resigning his post as minister, in 1870, Gen. Schenck returned to Washington, where he has since resided.

He was a member of the House of Representatives, and served four terms, and until 1851 when he was sent by President Fillmore as minister to Brazil.

When the civil war broke out he promptly offered his services, and was appointed by President Lincoln, his commission bearing the date of May 17, 1861.

Gen. Schenck was a member of the division of the army of the Potomac, and in December, 1870, he was appointed minister to England by President Grant. Resigning his post as minister, in 1870, Gen. Schenck returned to Washington, where he has since resided.

He was a member of the House of Representatives, and served four terms, and until 1851 when he was sent by President Fillmore as minister to Brazil.

When the civil war broke out he promptly offered his services, and was appointed by President Lincoln, his commission bearing the date of May 17, 1861.

Gen. Schenck was a member of the division of the army of the Potomac, and in December, 1870, he was appointed minister to England by President Grant. Resigning his post as minister, in 1870, Gen. Schenck returned to Washington, where he has since resided.

He was a member of the House of Representatives, and served four terms, and until 1851 when he was sent by President Fillmore as minister to Brazil.

When the civil war broke out he promptly offered his services, and was appointed by President Lincoln, his commission bearing the date of May 17, 1861.

Gen. Schenck was a member of the division of the army of the Potomac, and in December, 1870, he was appointed minister to England by President Grant. Resigning his post as minister, in 1870, Gen. Schenck returned to Washington, where he has since resided.

He was a











